

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/814,807	04/01/2004	Masato Hayashi	042320	5316
38834	7590 07/05/2006		EXAMINER	
WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP			RHEE, JANE J	
SUITE 700	CTICUT AVENUE, NW		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTO	ON, DC 20036		1745	
			DATE MAILED: 07/05/2006	ς.

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/814,807	HAYASHI ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jane Rhee	1745	
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence addres	is
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING Description of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNI 136(a). In no event, however, may a will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON e, cause the application to become Al	CATION. reply be timety filed ITHS from the mailing date of this commu	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on			
,	—· s action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa		ters, prosecution as to the me	erits is
closed in accordance with the practice under	•	•	
Disposition of Claims			
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-5</u> is/are pending in the application.			
4a) Of the above claim(s) 4 and 5 is/are withdi			
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6) Claim(s) 1-3 is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc		by the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	•	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct			.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	xaminer. Note the attached	d Office Action or form PTO-1	52.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		_	
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	n priority under 35 U.S.C. §	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).	
a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:			
1. Certified copies of the priority documen		wallandan Ni	
2. Copies of the partified copies of the prior		· ·	~~
<ol> <li>Copies of the certified copies of the price</li> <li>application from the International Burea</li> </ol>	=	received in this National Stat	Je
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	received	
1	The state of the s		
,			
Attachment(s)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)	
<ol> <li>Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> <li>Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08</li> </ol>	_	s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application (PTO-152	2)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:		•

### **DETAILED ACTION**

### Election/Restrictions

- 1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
  - I. Claims 1-3, drawn to an article, classified in class 428, subclass 69.
  - II. Claims 4-5, drawn to a method, classified in class 156, subclass 60.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions II and I are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make another and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the product can be made by another and materially different process such as extruding the sheets then stacking them together and then vacuum seal them.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

During a telephone conversation with Mr. Yoshizaki on June 14,2006 a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1-3. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 4-5 withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Application/Control Number: 10/814,807 Page 3

Art Unit: 1745

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nowobilski et al. (4726974) in view of Rusek Jr. et al. (5591505).

As to claim 1, Nowoilski et al. discloses a vacuum heat insulating material with a construction in which a core material (figure 1 number 3) and a gas absorbent (col. 3 lines 33-37) are housed in a bag made from a gas barrier film (col. 2 line 2-3) and the interior thereof is reduced in internal pressure thereof and air-tightly sealed (col. 3 lines 65-68), wherein the core material is a molded product obtained by coating a binder on inorganic fibers (col. 3 lines 3-12) having a average fiber diameter of less then 5um (col. 2 lines 46-48) which reads on applicant's claimed range of 3-5um. As to claim 2, Nowoilski et al. discloses that the inorganic fibers are glass fibers (col. 1 line 65). As to claim 3, Nowoilski et al. discloses that the binder is phenolic type binder (col. 3 line 4).

Application/Control Number: 10/814,807 Page 4

Art Unit: 1745

Nowoilski et al. fail to disclose binder coating amount in the range of 0.5 to 1.5wt%. Rusek Jr. et al. teaches a fibrous insulation product that comprises a collection of fiberous material having a binder dispersed throughout the fibrous material (col. 2 lines 9-11). Rusek Jr et al. teaches 0.1% to about 7 % by weight of binder based on the weight of glass in the insulation product (col. 5 lines 23-24) which is within applicant's claimed range of 0.5-1.5wt% for the purpose of providing an insulation product that is ideally suited for use in high temperature, low smoke, odorless evacuated atmosphere and building insulation applications.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time applicant's invention was made to provide 0.1% to about 7 % by weight of binder based on the weight of glass in the insulation product in order to provide an insulation product that is ideally suited for use in high temperature, low smoke, odorless evacuated atmosphere and building insulation applications.

As to heat pressing the inorganic fibers, or a laminate fabricated by stacking two or more sheets of the molded product is a product by process limitation. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process. *In re Thorpe*, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

#### Conclusion

Application/Control Number: 10/814,807 Page 5

Art Unit: 1745

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jane Rhee whose telephone number is 571-272-1499. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick Ryan can be reached on 571-272-1292. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Jahe Rhee June 24,2006 SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER